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Statement on Report Preparation
Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WSCUC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

Report preparation began in January 2014 with the establishment of a Task Force consisting of a core group to manage the Interim Report process and subgroups to address each issue identified by the WASC Commission Action Letter of 2012. Additional Task Force members from key stakeholder groups participated in early reviews and revision to drafts of the report. The Task Force reports to the Provost through the Vice Provost for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness.

From spring to fall 2014, the working subgroups collected and analyzed evidence to determine progress on each issue. Subgroups drafted reports on their respective issues in fall 2014, with review by additional stakeholders listed below beginning in January 2015. Each review informed revisions.

Key stakeholder groups reviewing and providing feedback to the draft report included: University Assessment Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Student Success Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Academic Council, Council of Assistant and Associate Deans, Leadership Team of the Division of Student Life, the Provost’s Leadership Council (includes all Deans and Provost Administrative Leadership staff), and the President’s Cabinet. The Board of Regents has been apprised of progress on these issues and will review the final draft at their spring 2015 board meeting.

The core group managing the process consisted of:
Cyd Jenefsky, Vice Provost for Strategy & Educational Effectiveness
Berit Gundersen, Associate Provost for Educational Effectiveness & Faculty Affairs
Eileen McFall, Director of Learning and Academic Assessment
Victoria Oliva, Project Support Specialist, Office of the Provost

Subgroups are, by issue:
Strengthening Systems of Assessment and Program Review
Eileen McFall, Director of Learning and Academic Assessment
Eric Boyce, Co-Chair of University Assessment Committee
Greg Rohlf, Associate Professor, College of the Pacific, former Chair of Academic Affairs
Jon Schamber, Co-Chair Institutional Effectiveness Committee (AY 2013-14 member)
Sandy Mahoney, Director of Assessment and Student Development Services, Student Life

**Enhancing Student Success and Diversity**
Elisa Anders, Associate Dean of Students, Division of Student Life
Joanna Royce-Davis, Dean of Students, Division of Student Life (AY 2013-14 member)
Lou Matz, Assistant Provost for Academic Student Support and Retention
Marcia Hernandez, Assistant Dean, Associate Professor of Sociology, College of the Pacific
Mike Rogers, Director of Institutional Research

**Establishing Faculty Workload Guidelines**
Berit Gundersen, Associate Provost for Educational Effectiveness & Faculty Affairs
Caroline Cox, Special Projects Advisor to the Provost (AY 2013-14 member)
Cynthia Dobbs, Associate Professor, College of the Pacific

**Additional Task Force Members from Stakeholder Groups**
Chris Goff, Assistant Provost for Diversity
Courtney Lehmann, Chair, Academic Council
Jim Uchizono, Chair, Academic Affairs
Linda Skrla, Committee on Graduate Studies
Melinda Westland, Graduate Student Representative
Rosa Munoz, Student Representative
Sharmila King, Academic Council
Yesenia Gutierrez, Student Representative
List of Topics Addressed in this Report
Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

1. STRENGTHENING SYSTEMS OF ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM REVIEW
2. ENHANCING STUDENT SUCCESS AND DIVERSITY
3. ESTABLISHING FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES
Institutional Context

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information so that the Interim Report Committee panel has the context to understand the issues discussed in the report.

University of the Pacific is the first chartered institution of higher education in California, currently celebrating its 164th year. In 1851 pioneer Methodist ministers founded the school as California Wesleyan College. The University moved in 1923 from its San Jose location to a new campus in Stockton, bringing private higher education to the San Joaquin Valley. The University was first accredited in 1949. Today, University of the Pacific is an independent institution of 6,304 students (as of fall 2014) on three campuses in Northern California. On its Stockton campus, Pacific features the College of the Pacific (liberal arts and sciences), the Conservatory of Music, the Gladys L. Benerd School of Education, the Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, the School of Engineering and Computer Science, and the Eberhardt School of Business. Stockton is also the location of the Graduate School and the Center for Professional and Continuing Education. The Arthur A. Dugoni School of Dentistry is located on the San Francisco campus, and the Pacific McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento. Pacific undergraduate students benefit from small class sizes with an average class size of 20 and student-faculty ratio of 14:1. While 87 percent of Pacific students come from California, 27 other states and 31 foreign countries are also represented.

The University's guiding educational mission is “to provide a superior, student-centered learning experience integrating liberal arts and professional education and preparing individuals for lasting achievement and responsible leadership in their careers and communities.” Pacific pursues this mission in curricular programs like its nationally recognized multidisciplinary Pacific Seminars general education series, which includes three thematically linked first-year and fourth-year core courses. Two first-year courses examine the question “What Is a Good Society?” while the fourth-year course prepares and prompts seniors to engage in ethical reasoning about personal relationships, career and work, and citizenship. Our students have the opportunity to expand their education through our outstanding Office of Research and Scholarship, which connects students to their passions through prestigious fellowships, funding for undergraduate research, and invaluable internship opportunities. Plans to further invigorate the Career Center are also underway which will provide students improved opportunities for mentoring, networking and internships. The Office of International Programs and Services offers 200 programs of study through its Education Abroad program, allowing Pacific students to engage with other cultures, languages and societies in over 90 different countries. Co-curricular programs, such as the Center for Community Involvement, encourages undergraduate students to reach beyond the gates of the University and become involved serving the communities of Stockton. Graduate and professional students serve communities on all three campuses, including Sacramento, and San Francisco.

President Pamela Eibeck, who began her tenure in 2009, and Provost Maria Pallavicini, who joined the University in 2011, are leading Pacific to address important new challenges facing Pacific and higher education generally. On October 5, 2012, University of the Pacific’s Board of Regents approved a new strategic plan, Pacific 2020, to guide Pacific’s development through this decade. As part of its implementation, the University engaged in an intensive comprehensive review of academic and administrative units in 2013-14 to align units with the goals and objectives of Pacific 2020. The academic division undertook an exhaustive portfolio review (Academic Planning and Alignment) which involved every academic unit at Pacific. Findings from that review are now being implemented in program/unit reorganizations, enhancements, and closures, with ongoing monitoring and follow-up incorporated into the regular cycle of program review and oversight. Pacific also successfully reallocated funds to create a
$13 million **Strategic Investment Fund**. Faculty and staff can submit proposals to use these funds for new programs, program enhancements, new infrastructure capacities, and to enhance program excellence. Currently Pacific is completing its academic plan to guide the next stage of implementation of *Pacific 2020*. “Crossing Boundaries for Academic Excellence” will set academic priorities and strategic allocations of resources for the next three to five years. These important planning and evaluation processes have enabled us to examine our strengths and challenges, design concrete plans for improving our capacities and services, and leverage our strengths to enhance the relevance, excellence and value of a Pacific education. With the implementation of *Pacific 2020*, the University is making direct connections between strategic planning, academic planning and resource allocation.

During the last two years, Pacific has also embraced the goal of becoming a more fully integrated three-city university. The most notable step to this goal is the November 2011 acquisition of property for a new campus in the South of Market district in San Francisco. In addition to providing a new state-of-the-art facility for the Dugoni Dental School and its public clinics, the new campus provides space for greater three-city collaboration through new academic programs. Audiology clinics have already opened at the site, soon to be followed by the new Doctor of Audiology program and graduate programs in Analytics, Music Therapy, and Food Studies. Additional space has also become available on the Sacramento campus to accommodate collaborative programs from the other campuses.
Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

This main section of the report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter(s) as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission’s action letter should be addressed. The team report (on which the action letter is based) may provide additional context and background for the institution’s understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes. Responses should be no longer than five pages per issue.

1. STRENGTHENING SYSTEMS OF ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM REVIEW

Issue (CFR s 1.2, 2.3-7, 2.11, 4.4-6)

The WASC Commission Action Letter noted that University of the Pacific had “come a very long way in developing a culture in support of learning assessment” in the two years between the CPR and EER. The Commission noted the effective use of the Assessment Working Group and Institutional Effectiveness Committee, especially with regard to faculty ownership of assessment and academic program review. The Action Letter highlighted the need to address unevenness in assessment practices and to demonstrate “a coordinated, university-wide assessment plan at both undergraduate and graduate levels, fully articulated program review cycles showing the results of outcomes measurements and improvements that will enhance student learning, and further work in the assessment of university outcomes in General Education beyond the successful Pacific Seminars.”

Pacific’s Action

Continued progress on faculty ownership of and organizational support for program review and assessment:

The University has continued progress with regard to enhancing faculty ownership of assessment and program review processes since the Commission Action Letter of 2012. As well, Pacific has strengthened organizational infrastructure to support these processes.

- The Assessment Working Group (AWG), appointed by the former Provost in 2010, continued to provide assessment leadership through spring 2014, including developing an initial assessment plan for the WASC Core Competencies.
- In April 2014, Academic Council (Pacific’s academic senate) unanimously approved formal adoption of AWG, renamed the University Assessment Committee (UAC), as a joint faculty-administrative committee. The UAC provides mentoring and recommendations for university-wide assessment of academic and student development programs. The work plan for 2014-15 includes review of guidelines for assessment of student learning, core competency assessment, review of program assessment plans, and oversight of assessment of university-wide institutional learning objectives (ILOs).
- The pilot Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) streamlined the university’s program review guidelines in 2013-14 and was formally adopted as a joint faculty-administrative
committee in fall 2014 by the Academic Council. The IEC is responsible for oversight of the program review process, including follow-up to action plans.

- A faculty-staff task force on Reporting and Tracking Systems was appointed by the Provost in spring 2014 to research current practices and future needs of the university community to track assessment, program review, and accreditation data, as well as progress on Pacific’s strategic priorities. The task force was asked to identify the methodologies, software, and databases that would position Pacific to readily and efficiently enter and track data in order to make data-informed decisions within academic and administrative units. In fall 2014, the task force recommended university adoption of Taskstream for collection and management of assessment activity, addressing a barrier to systematic reporting and sharing of results. Implementation of Taskstream will begin summer 2015.

- The Provost converted 1.5 FTE positions to lead and coordinate educational effectiveness processes: a Vice Provost for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness and an Associate Provost for Educational Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs. The Vice Provost is the liaison to Academic Affairs, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the University Assessment Committee and supports their work.

- Each school/college has a designated assessment director or coordinator to support assessment efforts with in the unit and coordinate activities university-wide.

**Progress on Evenness in Assessment Practices across the University:**

The University has sustained highly developed assessment practices, including use of findings for improvement, in the Dugoni School of Dentistry, the School of Engineering and Computer Sciences, the Benerd School of Education, the Eberhardt School of Business, Thomas J. Long School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, and the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. The Division of Student Life has continued its strong, program-based assessment of student learning and institutional learning outcomes and now has eight years of data and evidence-based improvements. At the time of the EER, assessment of student learning outcomes was still in the early stages for many other programs, especially in the College of the Pacific and the Conservatory of Music.

Systematic progress on assessment is most marked in the College of the Pacific. As of fall 2014, 15 of 19 departments in the College have completed several annual cycles of assessment of student learning and as of spring 2015, all departments have developed multi-year assessment plans. UAC is providing guidance and support to all departments initiating multi-year assessment plans. Departments with established assessment plans are using results to make program improvements. Eleven departments have assessed graduation level mastery. Departments not yet achieving graduate level mastery are being guided with the support from the Director of Academic Assessment in plan development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - Progress in College of the Pacific</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program learning outcomes (PLO)</td>
<td>All 19 departments had PLOs</td>
<td>All 19 departments have PLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing PLO</td>
<td>No departments had yet published PLOs</td>
<td>All departments have published PLO’s on their websites and University catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment reports</td>
<td>Eight departments had submitted a single assessment report for their programs</td>
<td>15 departments have at least three years of annual assessment cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/program level</td>
<td>15 departments conducted only course-level assessment for their programs</td>
<td>15 departments have program-level assessment findings for their programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two departments had made improvements based on assessment results; 15 departments have evidence of program improvements resulting from use of assessment findings; four departments have tracked outcomes long enough to document improvements in student achievement resulting from actions.

Departments with highly developed assessment in the College of the Pacific include Communication, History, School of International Studies, and Visual Arts. In those departments, the faculty engages in regular assessment of program learning outcomes, mostly through course-embedded assessments, with faculty collaborating to analyze results and decide on action plans. With several years of assessment findings, faculty in the Department of Communication are turning their attention in the undergraduate program to those students scoring in the bottom quartile on program assessments, with the aim of improving student learning and success for those most in need. Capstone assessment of History majors led to focused attention on the area in which students were weakest, information literacy, with the result that both program assessment and data from the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy (SAILS) test show those majors to be stronger than other majors in information literacy skills. The School of International Studies (SIS), which is now a school in the College of the Pacific, has used assessment results to target instructional improvements (for example, in students’ use of supporting evidence in research papers) and has demonstrated the effectiveness of instructional changes by comparing student results over time. SIS has used assessment findings to revise course curricula to better support the skills in which students need the most guidance, such as understanding the limitations and implications of research. SIS and the Visual Arts department are now using assessment results and recommendations from the university’s Academic Planning and Alignment process to redesign their programs.

In addition to the four departments with highly developed annual assessment processes, another eleven departments have relatively well developed assessment practices. These include Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Economics, English, Mathematics, Modern Languages and Literature, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Theatre Arts. In each case, assessment has been underway since 2010 or earlier, and departments have used results for improvement of student learning, to document the program’s effectiveness, or both.

While all departments have engaged in assessment of their academic degree programs, four have not progressed as expected; they have completed three years of assessment reports, but findings have not yet been systematically used for improvements. In each case, lack of progress is either being addressed through action plans generated by the Academic Planning and Alignment process, or programs are being reorganized or redesigned with assessment plans and program course level outcomes required as a part of this process.

The Conservatory of Music remains an area where use of assessment for program improvement is uneven. Music Education, Music Therapy, and Music Management all engage in regular assessment, reporting, and documentation. However, while the Conservatory has robust formative and summative assessment of individual student performance built into its curricula for Performance majors, there are still significant barriers to aggregating and using assessment data for program improvement. The adoption of an assessment management system will facilitate the aggregation of assessment, and the Conservatory’s Assessment Director is working with the faculty to develop program level assessment plans.
Progress on Coordinated University-Wide Assessment at Undergraduate, Graduate and Professional Levels:

Approximately 80% of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs conduct systematic assessment as evidenced in the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators: Academic Division. Data collection occurs annually and analysis/reporting occur either annually or according to specialized accreditation cycles; for example, teacher preparation programs have biennial reporting cycles. In Pacific’s decentralized approach, programs determine the best measures of student achievement. A notable exception to this decentralized approach is the assessment of university-wide learning objectives, including WASC core competencies, which is overseen by the University Assessment Committee. The UAC is also in the process of reviewing university-wide guidelines for assessment at Pacific.

The university launched its planning to assess the five core competencies shortly after adoption of the WASC 2013 Handbook. During the 2013-14 academic year, the University sent teams of faculty and staff to several WASC core competency workshops. This resulted in producing a first draft of a university-wide core competency assessment plan in spring 2014. The first core competency, information literacy, was assessed that same term. The Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy (SAILS) was administered to first-year students in 2011 and the same cohort in 2014. The main finding is that first-year students enter University of the Pacific scoring lower than first-year students at other doctoral granting institutions, but Pacific senior students score higher than seniors at other doctoral granting institutions. The results from the SAILS test are helping the librarians to examine their instruction program to improve instruction to first-year students. The results will also help librarians inform their engagement with PACS 2 general education seminars in the future. The results from the initial SAILS test did not include a large enough sample size to disaggregate by program, and we have made adjustments with the second administration of the test to ensure sufficient sample sizes. The SAILS test was re-administered to first year students in early spring 2015 and will be administered again to the same class of students as seniors in 2018. In this way, the findings will be usable by programs for their improvement efforts while documenting institutional effectiveness.

Policies and practices have been implemented to increase accountability for assessment and to make assessment an explicit part of faculty work. The Academic Affairs Committee requires program and course learning outcomes on all new and revised course proposals, and requires program learning outcomes and assessment plans on all new and revised program proposals. Faculty responsibility for assessment is specified in the university Faculty Workload Policy and in the faculty handbook, including promotion and tenure guidelines (Faculty Handbook 7.5.4.a), as well as in some of the schools’ governance documents.

Program Review:

Pacific continued its program review process with 11 academic programs and 5 student life programs completing self-studies, external reviews and action plans during 2012-14. Results and current status of actions plans for all program reviews conducted during this time frame can be found in the summary table of program review. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is charged with reviewing progress on the action plans at the mid-point of the review cycle to ensure accountability and transparency.

In 2013-14, Pacific suspended the regular program review cycle—although we continued to complete those already underway—in order to conduct a university-wide portfolio review of all academic and administrative programs as part of implementing the strategic plan (Strategy 1.2: “Strengthen or align..."
current programs to meet student and workforce demand”). The academic portion of this review, Academic Planning and Alignment (APA), focused on evaluating quality, financial sustainability, and alignment with Pacific 2020. APA included key elements of program review including evaluation of enrollment trends, retention and graduation rates, student support processes, program and institutional learning outcomes, program improvement processes, faculty contributions to the field, post-graduate success, new program opportunities in light of changing conditions and market demands, and alignment with strategic plan. Each academic program in the university conducted a data-based self-study, followed by two rounds of faculty peer evaluation (at the school/college level, subsequently at the university level). These materials were then submitted to the Deans and the Provost to inform their recommendations for each program (enhance, maintain, reduce, consolidate/reorganize, eliminate). This intensive and comprehensive process resulted in a university-wide slate of actions to ensure strategic alignment, and improve quality and financial sustainability of Pacific’s academic and administrative programs. Resulting action plans are being implemented university-wide, and the regular cycle of program review resumes in 2015-16 after the bulk of APA action plans have been completed.

Academic program review guidelines were revised, vetted and approved by Institutional Effectiveness Committee and Academic Affairs in spring 2014, followed by Academic Council in fall 2014. The revised guidelines streamline the process, intensify the focus on assessment of student learning, and incorporate a final planning section on program plans to adapt to the changing landscape of higher education. The administrative infrastructure supporting program review university-wide has also been strengthened. A new Vice Provost for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness and an Associate Provost for Educational Effectiveness and Faculty Affairs support academic program review. A new Associate Vice President for Planning oversees administrative program review.

General Education Assessment:

Since the Educational Effectiveness Review, assessment has continued in the Pacific Seminars and has also expanded to other areas in the General Education breadth program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 - General Education Assessment Progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty members, for undergraduate students, were asked to assess outcomes for one of the breadth area knowledge or skills using a current course assignment and a 4-point rubric. Planning and reporting workshops were held several times each semester to help faculty choose an assignment through which students would have the opportunity to demonstrate their learning and to help adapt or devise a rubric for scoring the assignment, including providing the AAC&U VALUE rubrics as models. Faculty members were asked how they would use assessment results, and most reported specific changes they would
make to strengthen instruction. Where faculty taught the same course in fall and spring, they reported on improvements in student learning in the spring. As a result of the expanded GE assessment, "Networked Improvement Communities" of faculty in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences have been developed to improve teaching and learning of writing in the disciplines. Each of the projects has an assessment component.

During 2014-15, feedback on the process and results of the 2013-14 assessment of Areas 1A and 1B have been used to streamline the reporting process through development of an online template, to disseminate information to the General Education Committee and University Assessment Committee for use in their work, and to create faculty development opportunities, such as a "Show and Tell" in which faculty who used Fall 2013 findings to improve their Spring 2014 course report their methods and results so other faculty can learn from their experience. The General Education Assessment plan can be found here.

**Conclusion**

Over the past five years, University of the Pacific has prioritized assessment of student learning and program review. Administrative leadership and support have been enhanced and shared governance and faculty leadership and ownership of assessment and program review processes have been strengthened. The University is poised to implement Taskstream to enable systematic input and use of all assessment and program review data, including for tracking progress on program review action plans as well as for alignment with overarching university priorities.

Pacific has also made significant investments in time, human resources and finances to support leadership development in assessment. The university has supported three academic administrators to complete the WASC Assessment Leadership Academy and has supported several other faculty and administrators to participate in other professional development to build capacity in assessment and program review. Pacific faculty and both academic and co-curricular administrators have presented their work at regional and national conferences and, at Pacific, have participated in learning communities and other professional development opportunities on campus.

Participation in program-level assessment has expanded steadily, and is now established as a regular practice among approximately 80% of academic units. The university’s goal is for all programs to be at the “developed” or “highly developed” level of the WASC Educational Effectiveness Framework rubric by our next accreditation visit in 2019.

**2. ENHANCING STUDENT SUCCESS & DIVERSITY**

**Issue (CFRs 1.2, 1.5, 2.2, 2.10-14, 4.5)**

With its institutional focus on student success, the Commission recognized that Pacific could be a model of inclusive excellence and student success support but that “more determined efforts are needed in order to meet established goals.”

As noted by WASC, Pacific has not been meeting its persistence and graduation rate targets. For example, Pacific’s average persistence rates into the second, third, and fourth years over the past five years (2007-2011 cohorts) are listed below in comparison to its targets.
With respect to its graduation rates, Pacific’s 4 and 6-year average graduation rates over the past five years (2004-2008 cohorts) are listed below in comparison to its targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Avg. 4 year grad rate</th>
<th>Avg. 6 year grad rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific target</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In **disaggregating the first-year persistence and six-year graduation rates**, Pacific’s rates are substantially lower for African-American and international students than other student populations.

In response, the Commission requested that Pacific take the following actions:

1. Gather evidence regarding impediments to persistence, retention and graduation, especially among underrepresented groups, including Latino/as, African-Americans and the large and diverse Asian student population;
2. Identify best practices in success initiatives;
3. Assess the effectiveness of advising; and
4. Improve student services that contribute to persistence.

Since the WASC visit, Pacific has elevated the importance of student success as an institutional priority by establishing best practice structures, and created positions and processes to facilitate development of a comprehensive and integrated plan to improve student persistence and graduation rates. In particular, Pacific has taken the actions below, grouped chronologically, to address the Commission’s requests. *(Note that the numbers that follow the description of the actions correspond to the four Commission areas delineated above.)*

## Pacific’s Action

Spring 2013
- **Hired an external consultant** to conduct a review of Pacific’s retention practices. *Commission areas addressed: 1, 2*
  - **Established an Academic and Career Advising Planning Committee** that reviewed Pacific’s advising practices and made recommendations based on best practices to improve academic and career advising. This report also informed the internal Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) proposal to improve student success. *Commission areas addressed: 2, 3*

Fall 2013
- **Implemented a pilot revision to the developmental writing program that reduces the amount of time to complete the fundamental (remedial) skills writing requirement.** The centerpiece of the revision was to reduce three stand-alone remedial writing courses to one course and to incorporate two of the existing remedial courses into the college-level writing requirement as a writing studio. Based on two years of assessment ([PACS One Pilot Performance Assessment Report Fall 2013](#), [PACS One Plus Assessment Report Fall 2014](#)), the pilot has proven successful and has now become
permanent. Moreover, for the fall 2011-13 new freshmen cohorts, the average first-year persistence rate for students in the new remedial writing program was 88%, which is 6% higher than for the former program and higher than the overall rate for that time period (Fall 2011 - 13 Entering Freshmen Remediation Data). Commission areas addressed: 2,4

- **Integrated the Student Referral Center into the new early alert efforts in Student Academic Support Services** to provide a holistic view and prioritization of referrals and responses to students in need. This case management approach serves as a pilot for planning underway with the forthcoming early alert tool and staffing. **Commission areas addressed: 1, 2, 3, 4**

- **Allocated additional staffing and operating resources to support equity programs**, as recommended by Pacific’s Strategic Task for on Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (June 2012). The Community Involvement Program is a need-based scholarship program for first-generation college students from the Stockton community, and Students Emerging as Pacificans (STEPs) serves first year, African-American students. **Commission areas addressed: 1,2,4**

- **Reviewed updated disaggregated data on persistence and graduation rates and identified the following at-risk groups and trends:**
  - **Academically underprepared students and students struggling after their first semester at Pacific** are at a high risk of dropping out. Specifically, students who enter university with a high school GPA of <3.10 and those with <2.0 GPA after the first and/or second term are at greater risk for failure. Similarly, students in developmental math or writing with D/F/W/I grades are at much greater risk for failure.
  - **International students** have a 6-year graduation rate of 54.5%, significantly lower than the average of 66.4% for the total population.
  - **African-American students** are a high-risk demographic group with an average 6-year graduation rate of 47%, 20% below the average total 6-year rate.
  - **Failure in specific gateway courses** (such as biological sciences, mathematics, and economics) is an indicator of risk for dropping-out.
  - **Out-of-state and southern California students** also graduate in smaller percentages than our overall population ([disaggregated persistence and graduation rate data](#)). **Commission areas addressed: 1**

Spring 2014

- **External consultant issued retention analysis and best practice report.** The review identified significant at-risk factors for Pacific students, the profiles of both at-risk and successful students, and the current student support interventions and gaps. This report informed an internal Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) proposal to improve student success. **Commission areas addressed: 1, 2**

Summer 2014

- **Created an Assistant Provost position to oversee student academic support and retention** and help coordinate student support services with the Division of Student Life in order to improve retention and graduation rates. This person oversees the developmental programs (writing and math), general tutoring, and academic advising and collaborates with other administrative unit to create and implement strategies to improve retention. **Commission areas addressed: 1,2,3,4**

- **Established an Early Alert Team** to plan a more comprehensive and integrated approach for referral and case management and to select a tool to automate and centralize the process. The work of this
team informed the internal Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) proposal to improve student success. *Commission areas addressed: 1,2,3,4*

- **Established a presidential-commissioned Student Success Committee (SSC)** to identify impediments to retention and graduation, monitor indicators related to student success, identify gaps where student success can and should be enhanced, and make recommendations for actions to improve various aspects of student success and student outcomes as a whole based on best practices. The SSC is led by the Associate Vice President for Planning and is composed of key campus stakeholders. *Commission areas addressed: 1,2,4*

- **Hired a .5 FTE Assistant Provost for Diversity** to update Pacific’s Faculty Hiring Plan, support faculty retention, and oversee the University-wide Diversity Requirement. *Commission areas addressed: 2, 4*

- **Co-located Pacific’s Latino Outreach with the Latin American studies program** to integrate the academic program with Latino co-curricular and community activities to deepen student engagement, which contributes significantly to student persistence. *Commission areas addressed: 2, 4*

- **Reorganized the Division of Student Life based on a review of Retention, Persistence, and Inclusion Programs and Services.** Pacific’s peer student advising program has enhanced its partnership with equity programs to formally transition students into leadership opportunities within Student Academic Support Services. For example, former first-year participants of the Students Emerging as Pacificans (STEPS) program now serve as University-wide peer student advisors and through active programming also provide mentorship to the newest class of STEPs students. *Commission areas addressed: 2, 4*

**Fall 2014**

- **Deployed a new analytical institutional research reporting tool (Blackboard Analytics)** that allows faculty and staff to directly access information regarding learning and student success. This allows engaged faculty and staff to “drill-down” to the student-record level to identify students potentially at-risk and/or in need of support services. *Commission areas addressed: 1, 4*

- **Developed and funded a plan of best practices in student success for Pacific.** Funding for the Student Success SIF proposal was approved from Pacific’s Strategic Investment Fund ($760,000) to establish new positions, tools, and processes to improve four essential student support areas: referral and case management, advising, tutoring, and developmental skills (see table below for details). These areas were identified as needing improvement based on the work of the Student Success Committee. *Commission areas addressed: 2, 3, 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 5 - Student Success Action Plan</strong></th>
<th><strong>New Allocations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Service Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral and Case Management</strong></td>
<td>3.0 new FTE to implement Pacific’s early alert mechanism (tool), respond to student needs (case management), and strengthen institutional support for African-American/Black students (full-time director for STEPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purchase of a case management system or early alert tool that allows faculty/staff to raise alerts in real time, communicate the issue to students and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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relevant faculty/staff, coordinate appropriate support services, record actions taken, allow for integrated case management functionality, and provide documentation and reporting on all of the activities

| Advising | • The purchase of a degree advising and audit solution to replace the current system in order to better advise students of degree requirements, degree progress, and to post degree program maps  
• 1.5 new FTE to support implementation of degree advising and audit solution |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Tutoring | • A substantial increase in funding to cover all sections of the most significant gateway courses: three courses in biological sciences, five in mathematics, three in developmental math, and two in economics.  
• Full-time tutoring manager to better manage, coordinate, and assess tutoring |
| Developmental Skills | • Strengthened ESL support with the creation of a full immersion Intensive English Program (IEP) to develop English language competency.  
• Strengthened staffing to manage and deliver the developmental writing program |

- **Provided opportunity for internal grant funding to schools and divisions for student success.** Part of the Strategic Investment Fund ($500,000) is allocated for one-time “SEED” funding for up to $50,000 (or $100,000 for cross-disciplinary projects). The proposal focus for 2014-15 is improving student success. To date, four Schools, the Division of Student Life, and the Division of Business and Finance have submitted fifteen proposals to improve student success. Decisions on proposals will be made in spring 2015. **Commission areas addressed: 2, 4**

- **Expanded position responsibilities of Director of International Programs and Services (IPS) to oversee retention of international students.** This is a response to Pacific’s international student persistence and graduation rates. A new IPS Director was hired in September 2014 and has begun to implement improvements to international student services that impact retention. The new Intensive English Language program will report to the IPS Director. **Commission areas addressed: 1, 2, 4**

- **Identified through the Academic Planning and Alignment process high and low retention programs and the area of study of high concentration of underrepresented minorities.** This data collection and analysis is the foundation for ongoing awareness and improvement for student success, including action plans for low retention programs. **Commission areas addressed: 2, 4**

**Spring 2015**

- **Incorporated improvement of student success as one of the priorities in the inaugural Academic Plan.** Planning is currently underway and will be concluded this term. One of the plan’s three major goals focuses on student success. **Commission areas addressed: 4**

- **Implemented campus climate surveys** for students, staff and faculty to serve as an additional guide for improving student success. The surveys provide an opportunity for Pacific to compare local data with national data and trends. **Commission areas addressed: 4**

**Conclusion**

Pacific recognizes that improvement of persistence and graduation rates takes time, and it is now in a position to build upon its historical efforts to improve student success in a significant way. It has
disaggregated its persistence and graduation rate data, identified at-risk populations and risk factors, and identified gaps in student support services. This information led to the allocation of substantial resources to strengthen four foundational areas of student support services—referral/case management, advising, tutoring, and developmental education. The newly established Student Success Committee (SSC) is already making progress in identifying key milestones for student progress and in creating a more comprehensive, coordinated, and data-driven approach to the proactive monitoring and intervention of students who are at-risk of falling off track. The SSC will help Pacific understand more specifically why underrepresented populations, such as African-Americans, and international students, have lower persistence and graduation rates. Finally, the SSC will create stronger and more proactive institutional alignment among the delivery of key student success support services in order to help students persist and graduate in a timely way (Phase I Student Success Roadmap).

3. ESTABLISHING FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

**Issue (CFR 3.3)**

The Commission Action Letter noted that it is critical for the faculty to have a clear understanding of the expectations regarding the range of work for faculty, “including preparation, student advisement, committee service, scholarship, service to the broader community, and ongoing assessment of academic programs.” The Commission urged Pacific to establish “specific written policies relative to workload . . . across all levels and campuses.” The letter emphasized that this is especially true in the case of an emerging culture of evidence at Pacific, which is predicated upon the faculty’s coordination and continuing cultivation of assessment at course, program, and university levels.”

**Pacific’s Action**

Beginning in January 2013, Pacific conducted a comprehensive review of faculty workload:

- A review of all workload policies and practices of each school/college on all three campuses was conducted. As well, broad conversations were held with faculty and leadership in all academic units to understand the application and the impact of these policies.
- A review of workload policies from peer and aspirant peer institutions was conducted.
- Data from the 2011 Higher Education Research Institution (HERI) Pacific Faculty Workload Survey was reviewed.
- Promotions and tenure guidelines from each school/college were reviewed.
- Pacific’s 2009 Academic Council study on faculty service load was reviewed.
- Literature on faculty workload was reviewed.
- Institutional Research data on faculty profile was reviewed.

From this work emerged the 2014 Report on Faculty Workload at the University of the Pacific which subsequently guided the formulation of the University Faculty Workload Policy approved fall 2014.

**Findings from the Workload Report**

The University of the Pacific workload report affirms that Pacific values faculty contributions in teaching, research and creative works, and service. It also affirmed that a university-wide uniform formula for annual workloads is not conducive to responding to differences in academic disciplines, academic unit needs, the differential demands of faculty rank, and the unpredictable exigencies of individual faculty lives. The report also recognized that it is critical that what we value is aligned with our reward systems, including promotion and tenure policies.
All eight schools/college at the university have workload policies in place, to varying degrees of specificity and in accordance with different discipline-specific norms and accreditation requirements. While most of the schools specify five courses or 20 units of teaching or teaching equivalency as 50% of faculty workload (with scholarship and service meeting the other half), there are necessary variations determined by the unique nature of teaching and scholarship in different disciplines. In all units, quality teaching includes ongoing assessment of student learning and student advising (Table Distribution of Schools/College workload).

The unit workload policies and the promotions and tenure guidelines align with the values that Pacific sets forth. The university values teaching foremost, and Pacific’s faculty are expected to excel in teaching. We value the teacher-scholar model, wherein scholarship informs teaching and enriches the student experience by having faculty who are experts in their field engage their students in research. Pacific’s faculty members are thus expected to maintain a scholarly agenda that informs their teaching. Faculty members are also expected to infuse ongoing assessment of student learning within their teaching practices. In addition, we are committed to service to the university, to our local communities, and to our professional communities. Through activities performed in these areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service, the faculty is expected to be actively engaged in the collection and application of evidence designed to ensure excellence in teaching and learning.

Each academic unit is required to maintain procedures for determining an appropriate and equitable allocation of faculty obligations in teaching, scholarship and service. In accordance with the following study on faculty work, we are not assuming that equity requires uniformity across the institution:

> Although all faculty members should be treated according to carefully established university policies and procedures, equitable treatment does not mean identical treatment. Equity is not the same as uniformity. Instead, equity means ensuring that each faculty member is treated fairly after differences among faculty members are taken into account.


**University Workload Policy**

It is with these premises in mind that the University Faculty Workload Policy was developed. This policy was recently approved by Pacific’s Academic Council in December 2014 and the Board of Regents in January 2015. Key components of the policy include:

- Normal annual faculty workloads shall include: a minimum of 50% workload directed toward teaching, 20% workload directed toward scholarship, and 5% workload directed toward service. Should exceptional circumstances arise which limit a faculty member from contributing in all areas, alterations in the balance of workload for a limited duration may be requested. These requests must be approved by the Dean.
- Teaching responsibilities require faculty to achieve a high standard of instructional excellence, to share equitably the annual instructional responsibilities of their educational unit, to contribute to Pacific’s curricular diversity and richness, to engage in meaningful and constructive assessment that positively affects student achievement of learning outcomes, and to foster their students’ critical and creative abilities. Implicit and included in this component is work directed to student academic advising.
Scholarship responsibilities require faculty to maintain a program of research, scholarship and/or artistic endeavors that informs their teaching, contributes to the scholarly body of knowledge, and enhances the reputation of Pacific.

Service responsibilities require faculty to contribute actively to the university community, to ongoing development of their profession, and to the furthering relations between the University and the community.

Through activities performed in the areas of teaching, scholarship and/or service, faculty are expected to be actively engaged in the collection and application of evidence designed to ensure excellence in teaching and learning.

Each academic unit shall commit to keeping an updated faculty workload policy specific to the needs and requirements of their own academic area in support and furtherance of the university-wide workload policy.

The current workload policy applies only to tenured and tenure-track faculty, but Pacific recognizes the need to address workload concerns of both part- and full-time non-tenure track faculty. Focus groups with non-tenure track faculty have begun in spring 2015 to gain more insight into their specific workload concerns, and non-tenure track faculty will also participate in the faculty climate survey Pacific is conducting with the services of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Next steps

Unit-based policies are in the process of renewal and alignment with the university-wide policy. Conversations between the deans and faculty of each unit are underway to review and, as needed, revise existing unit-specific workload policies and procedures to align with the university-wide workload policy. Informing these conversations are the faculty workload report and the forthcoming data from the COACHE faculty climate survey, which will be conducted during spring 2015. This survey is designed to provide actionable diagnoses Pacific can use to make improvements in the quality of faculty work life.

There are three overarching themes comprising the survey inquiry:

- How do faculty of different career stages experience academic work life at our institution? How do their career experiences compare to those of faculty at peer institutions?
- Do their experiences differ by rank, gender, or race/ethnicity?
- What policies or practices are associated with high levels of faculty satisfaction and vitality?

The results will be made available to campus constituencies during summer and fall 2015. In fall 2015 administrators and faculty will embark on focused conversations about the survey results, the faculty workload report, and the university-wide workload policy. The partnership with COACHE will continue over the next two years (COACHE Timeline) as we work to better identify critical issues and develop best practices for a supportive workplace that fosters faculty excellence in each unit.

One measure of our success in addressing workload issues at Pacific will be the alignment of all unit level workload policies with the University Policy and revisions as appropriate. This collaborative work has been started and will be completed fall 2016, with the goal of unit-based aligned workload policies by January 2017.
Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee panel gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

Pacific has transformed since the 2012 site visit and action letter by WASC. In many ways we are not the same institution. There have been leadership changes to fill retirements and support implementation of Pacific 2020. In the Office of the President, two key Cabinet retirements have been filled by a new Vice President of Business and Finance and Vice President of Student Life. A new Associate Vice President for Planning has also joined Pacific and oversees implementation of Pacific 2020. Key leadership changes in the Office of the Provost to support implementation of Pacific 2020 include appointment of the Vice Provost for Distributed Learning, the Vice Provost for Strategy and Educational Effectiveness, the Assistant Provost for Diversity, a new Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, and realignment of two Assistant/Associate Provost positions to enhance support for student success and educational effectiveness. Two new Deans have also joined Pacific in the College of the Pacific and the School of Engineering and Computer Science, and the Dean of the School of Education is also serving as the Interim Dean of the Library.

This has been a very generative period for Pacific. The University has opened a new campus in San Francisco. The Dugoni School of Dentistry and its public clinics moved during summer 2014 from their location in Pacific Heights to the new state-of-the-art facility in the South of Market district. The seven-story, 395,000-square-foot campus contains flexible classrooms, lecture halls, a high-tech dental simulation laboratory, research labs, a café and support spaces, in addition to an array of general and specialty dental clinics utilized by approximately 10,000 patients each year. The campus also houses new state-of-the-art audiology public clinics and will soon house the University’s new Doctor of Audiology program, a Music Therapy program, and newly developed masters programs in Analytics and Food Studies.

At the same time, the Sacramento campus has experienced a contraction due to the nationwide decline in law school attendance. The Pacific McGeorge School of Law enrollment has decreased by approximately 30% across the past three years. An action plan, approved by the Board, has been developed to focus the legal education offered at McGeorge in key areas of the law (health, environment/water, and capital lawyering), to expand the legal degrees offered to include an MS in Laws with concentrations in key employment sectors (government and public policy, human resources, health law, water/environmental law, criminal justice), and to strengthen the career outcomes for McGeorge graduates. Enrollment and financial projections suggest a five year time period before the net revenues of the law school return to a strong level. Reserves created by McGeorge will handle their projected budget deficits, while the University will shift the Sacramento campus operational/facilities expenses to the general budget.

With space newly available on the Sacramento campus, Pacific is in the process of diversifying the offerings at this site. Three new graduate programs are planned to open during the 2016-17 academic year. The Business Forecasting Center has expanded and opened a new office on the Sacramento campus; it has diversified its research capacity beyond its influential regional economic forecasting to include more planning and policy projects, especially in the Sacramento area.
Our $13 million Strategic Investment Fund supports our strategic growth. The funds have been set up in three streams: funding for new academic programs and program enhancements ($7 million), one-time funding for capacity building ($6 million), and annual Strategic Educational Excellence Development (SEED) grants ($500,000). The new academic program fund works akin to venture investments: programs have up to three years to become self-sufficient before their start-up support from SIF ends; this frees up the $7 million fund for additional new programs and program enhancements. For the SEED grants, one-time funding for up to $50,000 (or $100,000 for cross-disciplinary projects) will be available through an annual and renewable competitive RFP process. The funds can be spent over a period of two years, and any individual, group, or unit may apply, including staff and faculty as described in the President’s Strategic Investment Fund (SIF) memo.

In 2013-14 Pacific completed its best fundraising year on record with the exception of the year the $100 million Powell commitment was officially recorded (2007). We received more than $31 million in new gift commitments (a 68% increase over last year) and nearly $18 million in cash received (a 12.5% increase). The Dugoni School raised more than $9 million last year, reaching the critical halfway point of their $40 million campaign. In addition, the University announced receiving the $125 million Powell Gift. With more than $80 million of the Powell Gift available for matching new endowed scholarship and academic program gifts, we have already received 45 endowed commitments totaling $8.09 million that are eligible for the Powell Match. This year work is progressing well on the University’s comprehensive fundraising campaign planning, with a prospectus drafted, a feasibility study completed and leadership volunteers becoming engaged. The University of the Pacific Board of Regents approved the campaign with a working goal of $300 million at the January 2015 meeting, effectively launching the “quiet phase” of the campaign.

The Chief Information Officer (CIO) position has been elevated to the Vice President level position and member of the President’s cabinet to coordinate the technology vision at the institutional level. As a result of a series of major technology breakdowns in the summer of 2013, the entire technology infrastructure has been undergoing a major upgrade, and a technology roadmap is in the process of implementation. This has produced a stable infrastructure and enhanced protocols that have resulted in a series of successful network upgrades and effective processes for continuous assessment of technology needs and infrastructures. An Interim CIO is in place while the search for the Vice President is underway. A Deputy CIO position has been established to oversee and manage technology operations and to support faculty development for digital teaching and learning. A Vice Provost for Distributed Learning (VPDL) has been brought on board to oversee and plan for expanded use of online teaching and learning. The VPDL also oversees expansion of programs and student support services beyond the Stockton campus.

The university is in the process of completing its academic plan to guide continued implementation of our strategic plan Pacific 2020. The plan will set clear academic goals for the next five years in alignment with Pacific 2020, will be used to allocate resources strategically, and will guide the subsequent development of a strategic enrollment management plan. The academic plan will be completed in spring 2015 and the strategic enrollment plan in summer 2015.
The WASC process has helped to strengthen the university in each of the three areas identified in the Commission Action Letter. Pacific has expanded and improved assessment and program review processes, coordinated across divisions to develop an expansive plan to support student success, and adopted a university-wide policy to clarify faculty workload.

Pacific has put into place governance structures, leadership, support mechanisms, and policies to systematize assessment and program review processes. The Faculty had strengthened oversight and ownership of these processes with the formal adoption and leadership of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) and University Assessment Committee (UAC). Assessment practices university-wide are reported regularly to assessment coordinators in each school/college and are embedded in the program review process. The UAC has begun drafting university-wide assessment guidelines with the aim of having them adopted fall 2015. UAC is also continuing to oversee implementation of the core competency assessment plan. With the completion of the university-wide portfolio review (Academic Planning and Alignment, APA), the university now has a comprehensive portrait of program assessment practices and results. The few remaining programs still needing to use learning results systematically to improve learning outcomes have completed comprehensive assessment plans as part of their APA action plans and are beginning to implement these plans. As the university moves to implement Taskstream, programs will be able to share results more readily. This will include the ability to repurpose program-level results to assess student achievement in GE and the university’s ILOs, including the five core competencies Pacific is required to address by the time of its next reaccreditation report in 2018.

Student success is one of Pacific’s top institutional priorities. Since the EER in 2012, Pacific has gained an in-depth understanding of impediments to student persistence. We have put in place mechanisms and significant funding for holistic planning and university-wide coordination of efforts to improve student retention and degree completion. The concerted efforts to support student success at Pacific have led to enhanced coordination between academic and co-curricular support services. Advising, tutoring, and developmental skills are being reinforced, and Pacific is putting in place a series of best practices and tools to be able to intervene earlier to support students at-risk of dropping out. This includes provision of dedicated support for African-American students, our demographic group with the lowest graduation rate. The roadmap in the Student Success SIF proposal indicates the schedule for implementation.

The Commission’s request that Pacific establish a university-wide policy on faculty workload prompted a two year conversation that engaged faculty across all units. The university studied and then adopted a university-wide policy. All unit level workload polices/practices will complete alignment with the university policy by fall 2015. Also from these discussions, Pacific decided it would benefit from a faculty climate survey to better understand faculty needs, including for work-life balance. We have partnered with COACHE to conduct the survey in spring 2015. COACHE will then use the results in 2015-16 to work with faculty to identify best practices and address outstanding needs. The survey and subsequent work will include tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at Pacific (COACHE Timeline).

The WASC process clearly has been productive for Pacific. Solid plans are established in each of the three areas to ensure continuing progress in years ahead. Moreover, these plans are integrated with larger university-wide efforts to continue to strengthen the quality, financial sustainability, and value of a Pacific education.